

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE JESUS MADRIGAL-DIAZ,

No. CR 07-0309 WHA

Petitioner,

v.

**ORDER REGARDING  
PETITIONER'S REPLY BRIEF**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,


Respondent.

A recent order stated that petitioner did not submit a reply brief in support of his Section 2255 motion by his deadline of December 1. Although unknown to the undersigned until now, the Clerk's office *did* receive petitioner's reply brief on December 6. The petition is therefore deemed submitted. Petitioner need not worry and need not respond to the prior order that stated incorrectly that petitioner had not submitted his reply brief.

Nevertheless, petitioner shall please respond to the separately issued order to show cause, which inquired whether docket entries 66 through 68 and 71 through 82 can be unsealed. Once petitioner responds regarding the question of sealing documents pertaining to his petition, his reply brief will be filed in a manner consistent with a determination regarding the sealing issue.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 10, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE